

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Defining collective capability in Australian evaluations that are conducted by, for and with Indigenous peoples for health programs, policies and services: a concept analysis protocol
AUTHORS	Maher, Bobby; Guthrie, Jillian; Sturgiss, Elizabeth; CARGO, Margaret; Lovett, Raymond

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Doyle, Kerrie Western Sydney University, School of Medicine
REVIEW RETURNED	02-Aug-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	Interesting concept, and needed in indigenist research, but protocol needs to be clearer please.
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Gwynne, Kylie Macquarie University
REVIEW RETURNED	13-Aug-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting and important paper. I really liked the emphasis on positionality and the explicit links of culture, context and the interpretation of research. I wonder if the team has reviewed this work and its potential relevance:</p> <p>Harfield S, Gibson O, Morey K, Kite E, Canuto K, Glover K, Streak Gomersall J, Davy C, Carter D, Aromataris E, Braunack-Mayer A. The CREATE Critical Appraisal Tool: A Tool To Appraise Research From Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Perspectives. Abstracts of the Global Evidence Summit, Cape Town, South Africa. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2017;(9 Suppl 1). https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD201702.</p> <p>I am also curious about how the authors see their work aligning with the NHMRC guidelines for ethical research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.</p>
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Sunderland, Naomi Griffith University
REVIEW RETURNED	02-Sep-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Dear Colleagues,</p> <p>it was a pleasure to read this protocol and learn more about your work in developing Indigenist evaluation methodologies. I see value in the work and would like to see this protocol published and</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>available. I share some queries below which I invite you to consider prior to publishing.</p> <p>Background, rationale, and Indigenist terminology in collective capability: Please expand the background story on why you are examining collective capability in particular for Indigenist evaluation. The overall justification for that approach needs clarifying and developing. How does a capabilities approach relate to or build on community asset based and strength-oriented evaluation methodologies? Why is a capabilities approach important e.g. in challenging deficit constructions of Indigenous peoples and knowledges?</p> <p>Acknowledge existing strengths in the field: You state early in the protocol that 'Indigenist evaluation has not been established in Australia' which I find to be an overgeneralisation. Can you spend some time briefly acknowledging existing strengths in and movements toward Indigenist evaluation in Australia in academic and grey literature as part of the background and introduction to this protocol? I believe acknowledging such strength and 'capability', however nascent, is vital within an overarching strength based and Indigenist approach to our work.</p> <p>Indigenist approach to concept analysis: The overall approach to concept analysis includes some elements of Indigenist research. I value the inclusion of in depth interviews as part of this protocol and the collaborative nature of mapping and review. It also appears as systematic and well considered. Can you more fully discuss and justify the choice of Rodgers' method in the context of Indigenist research? Why/how is that particular concept mapping approach suitable? In the limitations section, please comment on the limitations of weaving Indigenist and non-indigenous processes and concepts in this research and in the overarching naming of your potential emerging evaluation methodology (collective capability). What will happen if, as a result of this concept mapping, you need to alter the way you describe your resulting approach to Indigenist evaluation? It is unclear whether you are open to shifting your terminology in relation to collective capability as an Indigenist evaluation approach following the proposed research.</p> <p>Ethics process: Thank you for the information on ethics approval. Please provide further information on recruitment and consent building processes for the interviews. How will this be approached from an Indigenist research perspective? What benefits are participants likely to achieve through influencing and participating in this research? Will participants have further opportunities to shape the methodology and outcomes? How? How will data be shared or returned to participants and others who may be interested?</p>
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Comments	Author Response
<p>Reviewer: 1 Dr. Kerrie Doyle, Western Sydney University Comments to the Author: Interesting concept, and needed in indigenist research, but protocol needs to be clearer please.</p>	<p>Thank you for providing your feedback. We have amended the manuscript to provide more clarity.</p>
<p>Reviewer: 2 Dr. Kylie Gwynne, Macquarie University Comments to the Author: Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting and important paper. I really liked the emphasis on positionality and the explicit links of culture, context and the interpretation of research.</p> <p>I wonder if the team has reviewed this work and its potential relevance: Harfield S, Gibson O, Morey K, Kite E, Canuto K, Glover K, Streak Gomersall J, Davy C, Carter D, Aromataris E, Braunack-Mayer A. The CREATE Critical Appraisal Tool: A Tool To Appraise Research From Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Perspectives. Abstracts of the Global Evidence Summit, Cape Town, South Africa. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2017;(9 Suppl 1). https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD201702.</p> <p>I am also curious about how the authors see their work aligning with the NHMRC guidelines for ethical research with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.</p>	<p>Thank you for providing your feedback.</p> <p>Thank you for the reference to Harfield et al. We are aware of the CREATE critical appraisal tool, which is designed to appraise the quality of studies, primarily as part of a systematic review process. This concept analysis is a prior step to a critical appraisal to ensure a concept (term) is defined. We view a critical appraisal as a following step to definitions and terms have been developed. We don't see this reference as appropriate for this work.</p> <p>We view the NHMRC guidelines as a minimum standard and as such have been guided by the AIATSIS ethics guidelines and process and view these guidelines and processes as a more robust ethical framework.</p>
<p>Reviewer: 3 Dr. Naomi Sunderland, Griffith University Comments to the Author: It was a pleasure to read this protocol and learn more about your work in developing Indigenist evaluation methodologies. I see value in the work and would like to see this protocol published and available. I share some queries below which I invite you to consider prior to publishing.</p>	<p>Thank you for providing your comprehensive feedback on the manuscript. We have adopted several of the suggestions as indicated below.</p>

Comments	Author Response
<p>3.1 Background, rationale, and Indigenist terminology in collective capability: Please expand the background story on why you are examining collective capability in particular for Indigenist evaluation. The overall justification for that approach needs clarifying and developing.</p> <p>How does a capabilities approach relate to or build on community asset based and strength-oriented evaluation methodologies?</p> <p>Why is a capabilities approach important e.g. in challenging deficit constructions of Indigenous peoples and knowledges?</p>	<p>We have amended the Introduction to expand on the gaps in Indigenist evaluation including how the capability approach relates to community assets based and strength-oriented evaluation methodologies. We have additionally connected how collective capability centres Indigenous epistemology as a starting point for the concept analysis (page 5, lines 43-46; page 6, lines 1-27, 40-45; page 7, lines 1-4).</p> <p>We highlight our section in the 'Introduction' (page 6, lines 28-43) to highlight that capabilities are realised which is a more strengths based approach.</p>
<p>3.2 Indigenist approach to concept analysis:</p> <p>The overall approach to concept analysis includes some elements of Indigenist research. I value the inclusion of in depth interviews as part of this protocol and the collaborative nature of mapping and review. It also appears as systematic and well considered.</p> <p>Can you more fully discuss and justify the choice of Rodgers' method in the context of Indigenist research? Why/how is that particular concept mapping approach suitable?</p>	<p>Drawing on a modified Rodgers' evolutionary method is an appropriate method to developing the concept collective capability. The concept does not exist in evaluation practice, nor in population health. We have acknowledged the limitations of Rodgers method and have modified this to address these limitations in an Indigenist context. Indigenist approaches acknowledge western research methods as valid if they are applied by, for and with Indigenous people. The 'Methods' section has been updated to reflect this (page 7, line 35; and page 8, lines 14-28).</p>
<p>3.3 In the limitations section, please comment on the limitations of weaving Indigenist and non-indigenous processes and concepts in this research and in the overarching naming of your potential emerging evaluation methodology (collective capability).</p>	<p>Please see the response above (3.2), and our amended 'Methods' section (page 7-8). We have also amended the limitations in the 'Discussion' section (page 16, lines 28-44).</p>
<p>What will happen if, as a result of this concept mapping, you need to alter the way you describe your resulting approach to Indigenist evaluation?</p>	<p>To clarify, this is a concept analysis to define a concept and differs to concept mapping. This is a protocol outlining the steps we plan to undertake, however these may alter as a result of the process and we are open to this.</p>
<p>It is unclear whether you are open to shifting your terminology in relation to collective capability as an Indigenist evaluation approach following the proposed research.</p>	<p>Please see above.</p>
<p>Acknowledge existing strengths in the field:</p> <p>You state early in the protocol that 'Indigenist evaluation has not been established in Australia' which I find to be an overgeneralisation.</p> <p>Can you spend some time briefly acknowledging existing strengths in and movements toward</p>	<p>Please see response 3.1.</p> <p>We have amended the abstract and introduction to incorporate existing Indigenist elements and approaches in this space. We have also discussed how these existing</p>

Comments	Author Response
<p>Indigenist evaluation in Australia in academic and grey literature as part of the background and introduction to this protocol?</p> <p>I believe acknowledging such strength and 'capability', however nascent, is vital within an overarching strength based and Indigenist approach to our work.</p>	<p>approaches have some limitations in how they centre non-Indigenous researchers, evaluators and commissioners to conduct culturally appropriate evaluation, rather than being premised on Indigenous epistemologies (page 6, lines 8-27).</p>
<p>3.4 Ethics process:</p> <p>Thank you for the information on ethics approval. Please provide further information on recruitment and consent building processes for the interviews.</p> <p>How will this be approached from an Indigenist research perspective?</p>	<p>The research outlines the relational aspect between Indigenist research and the researcher. The research is Indigenous-led and the methods applied align with Indigenist approaches to reflect research that is by, with and for the benefit of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.</p> <p>Recruitment strategy has been included in the 'Methods' section (page 10, lines 15-26)</p> <p>Consent building processes updated in 'Ethics and Dissemination' (page 15, lines 26-36)</p>
<p>What benefits are participants likely to achieve through influencing and participating in this research?</p>	<p>We have updated the 'Ethics and Dissemination' section to include participant benefits (page 16, lines 3-6)</p>
<p>Will participants have further opportunities to shape the methodology and outcomes? How?</p>	<p>We have updated the 'Ethics and Dissemination' section to include participant and governance groups' contributions to shape the methodology and outcomes (page 15, line 37-39; and page 16, line 1-6).</p>
<p>How will data be shared or returned to participants and others who may be interested?</p>	<p>We have update the 'Ethics and Dissemination' section to include how data will be stored and shared (page 16, lines 7-14).</p>

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Sunderland, Naomi Griffith University
REVIEW RETURNED	06-Oct-2021

GENERAL COMMENTS	Congratulations to the authors on an excellent review. I look forward to the outcomes of this research.
-------------------------	---